

# Minutes

Minutes.

Membership Meeting - Thursday, May 21st, 1981

IRC 6

12:30-2:20 pm.

The meeting was chaired by Marcel Dionne and the minutes were recorded by Wendy Bice.

Before the agenda was adopted, several changes were made.

Moved by Ann Hutchison

Seconded by Irene McIntyre

THAT ITEM 8 EXECUTIVE REPORT BECOME  
JOB EVALUATION REPORT AND EXECUTIVE REPORT  
BECOME ITEM 8A

The motion was carried.

Moved by Nancy Wiggs

Seconded by Pat House

THAT WE TABLE ITEMS 2,3,4,9

The motion was carried

## 1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by Ann Hutchison

Seconded by Nancy Wiggs

THAT THE AGENDA BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED

The motion was carried

## 5. Nominations: Opening

Union Co-ordinator: Wendy Bice was nominated

### Closing

1. Alternate Provincial Representative - Elizabeth Brock had been nominated. Elizabeth Brock was elected by acclamation.

2. Alternate University Health and Safety Committee Representative Shirley Irvine had been nominated. Shirley Irvine was elected by acclamation.

3. Union Organizer - Lid Strand had been nominated and would not stand. Carole Cameron had been nominated and would stand. Helen Glavina had been nominated and would not stand. Carole Cameron was elected by acclamation.

4. Provincial Education Committee - there were no nominations. nominations will remain open until the meeting next month.

5. Communication Committee - Lori Thicke had been nominated and had given her assent. One position remains open. There were no further nominations.

## 6. Secretary-Treasurer Report

Carole Cameron asked if there were any questions pertaining to the Financial Statement which had been distributed to the membership at the meeting. There were none. Carole Cameron stated that half of the people who had been locked out due to the GVRD and TWU picketing had been reimbursed for lost wages. Carole requested the remaining people to do likewise as soon as possible.

Moved by Carole Cameron

Seconded by Larry Thiessen

THAT THE AUCE LOCAL I MEMBERSHIP APPROVE THE  
FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR THE MONTH ENDED APRIL  
30th, 1981.

The Motion was Carried

7. Grievance Committee report -

Carole referred to page 6 of the newsletter, and motivated the 1st motion.

Moved by Carole Cameron  
Seconded by Nancy Wiggs

THAT AUCE LOCAL I TAKE THE CLERK III  
RECLASSIFICATION GRIEVANCE TO ARBITRATION AND  
PAY ALL RELATED EXPENSES.

The motion was Carried

Carole Cameron motivated the 2nd motion. There were no question.

Moved by Carole Cameron  
Seconded by Nancy Wiggs

THAT AUCE LOCAL I TAKE THE PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEE  
DISMISSAL GRIEVANCE TO ARBITRATION AND PAY ALL  
RELATED EXPENSES.

The motion was Carried

Carole Cameron stated that a policy grievance was in process regarding reduction in the bargaining unit. Jobs are being posted and then filled at a lower classification; jobs are being posted and filled by professionals.

8. Job Evaluation Committee Report - Reclassification of certain groups in the bargaining unit.

Ann Hutchison spoke regarding the two motions on page 2 of the newsletter. She spoke to the arguments on the pink leaflet moved and seconded by some of the members of the Job Evaluation Committee. She referred to the last set of negotiations, where the University wanted to upgrade the Computer operators in order to keep them. The Contract Committee recommended rejection of the University package. Now the University calls this upgrading a reclassification. The University has taken them as a group and moved them from 1 step to another. They propose doing this to the Word Processors. In this case the University has written up job specifications and may move them to nonexistent paygrades. Do we allow the University to do this for their convenience or do we ask them to upgrade all? Nancy Wiggs cited the history of AUCE - jobs established on levels based on complexity, skills, responsibility required. The sense behind the structure is sound. Marketability is now thrown in. If we change our system, it shouldn't be on the basis of marketability. Pat Gibson stated we must be aware of changes in the workforce in the 21st century and must take each issue which arises separately. Must look at entire aspect. The problems with supply and demand must be considered. He would prefer to fit the new aspects into the present system - maybe reclassify to a higher paygrade if the new aspect demands more training. Further, we must look at the paygrade structure. The increments are too small. Promotional increases do not inspire incentive to seek promotion. Our 9.5% increase is poor. Our base rate is low, as is our top rate. Supply and demand should not determine salaries. Roberta Crosby stated that the Sec. II Work Processors' jobs are changing too. The University is unable to fill jobs. We could use this for leverage to bring all rates up. Helen Glavina said the University is changing the paygrade for Computer Operators not their job descriptions. The Jobs are not more complex. Why the piecemeal upgrading? To divide the Union? We are all not competitively paid. Gary Sawchuck disagreed, saying that the Computer Operators Job descriptions have changed, reorganization has taken place. GSAB & Computing Centre have merged and the operators are doing both jobs. The job is changing also with the advent

of new equipment. Upgrading is not based on marketability. The jobs have changed drastically. The operators applied for reclassification, wanting a pay upgrade due to increasing complexity of their job. The money is available for the Computing Centre only, and could not be applied to other AUCE members in the form of general raising of salaries. The money is part of the Computing Centre budget, allocated for equipment which would not be purchased if the operators were granted this increase. Lid Strand was against the University's proposal. He reiterated that lots of jobs are changing, all are underpaid. Increment steps should be removed, people with less than 6 years seniority are underpaid. Lid supports a wage reopener. Larry Thiessen was in favour of the proposal. He felt that if the Operators aren't replaced when they leave, their jobs may disappear. Also, since the money to be paid these operators is not coming out of the University's budget, the operators should get their increase. He felt that the wage reopener was a good idea but that the University wouldn't go for it. Lid Strand stated that the Computer Operators have pointed out how low we're all paid. The University is adding duties to jobs now, and although they may not consider a wage reopener now, it is worth a try as they considered the Computer Operators in the first place. Carole Cameron pointed out that 50% of the bargaining unit are on step 5 & 6 of the paygrades. Carole Cameron and Wendy Bice had gone to VGH Wednesday, where AUCE members are making \$200/month less than HEU members working side by side with them. CUPE is going for more than 9.5% and will thus be better paid than AUCE members as well. Carole stated that although she was in favour of the first motion, she was against the second motion. Why would the University listen to us if we reopened the contract? The University hasn't been impressed to date, even though we were on strike. She felt it to be misleading to imply that we could negotiate at this time. At this point, Ann Hutchison challenged the chair, saying that Carole should not have been discussing the second motion. Marcel ruled against Ann as all of the previous speakers had been speaking very generally and it would be unfair to forbid it at this point. Lid Strand conducted the vote, and the chair was upheld. Carole then continued, stating that she had worked at UBC since May 14/79 and the University had not yet demonstrated to her that they are a fair employer. If they were, they would have come to the Union to reopen the contract. They would only agree to do this if they wanted something from AUCE. She further stated that wage reopeners have to be mutually agreed to by both parties if there is no provision for this in the collective agreement. We have to consider their proposals should we reopen the contract, otherwise we will be bargaining in bad faith. We could be opening all items in the contract. We would have to perhaps go on strike and be prepared to take a strike vote. Carole expressed concern that a small core would have initiated a strike, and then later have it overturned. If we decide to do this we must be prepared for the consequences. Richard Melanson stated that he thought A&P staff should be in our bargaining unit. Elizabeth Brock then reported that marketability doesn't exist for women and our objective should be to fight for fair wages for everyone. We shouldn't help the University change our system. Nancy Wiggs stated that she agreed with Carole Cameron on the problem with contract reopeners. She further stated that she did support the 1st motion on the committee. She suggested that several committees inform the University of how we feel about piecemeal upgrading in the bargaining unit. Marcel Dionne passed the chair to Wendy Bice. He then stated that 95% of the people answering the questionnaires were dissatisfied with their classification. They want changes in the structure. Changes need to be made and how do you do this without changing the payscale? Irene McIntyre referred to page 4 of the newsletter in which Marcel Dionne stated his opinion on the subject of job evaluation. She felt that Marcel shouldn't be able

to speak at the meeting as he has a vested interest in the reclassification of the Computer Operators. Pat Gibson stated that if the President wishes to speak at a meeting he must turn the chair over to someone else when he expresses his opinion. When it was ascertained that Marcel had done this, Pat continued, stating that the Chairperson has the right to his opinion, as does everyone else, but that when he states his opinion in the newsletter he should not use his title along with his name. The question was called on the first motion:

Moved and Seconded by the  
Job Evaluation Committee

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP REAFFIRMS ITS POSITION  
TAKEN DURING OUR LAST SET OF NEGOTIATIONS  
BY REJECTING ANY PIECEMEAL UPGRADING BY THE  
UNIVERSITY.

The vote was taken and counted by the trustees. The response was 99 YES and 40 NO.

The motion was carried

Ann Hutchison stated that she was disturbed by Carole Cameron's negativity. She suggested that the reason the last strike was unsuccessful was due to money, and that it was tactically incorrect. We should have to face reality of a long drawn out strike. This could happen next time. Ann referred to the CUPE/GVRD strike. Larry Thiessen stated that we shouldn't go to the University re: wage reopeners, but let them come to us. The issue is whether to ask for the money for all of us, and whether they come to us or we go to them. Lid Strand was in favour of the motion #2. He stated that we must prepare for negotiations, and that we need more than 6-8 months at least to prepare. Irene McIntyre was in favour of the motion. She stated that it was unrealistic perhaps to think the University would give us all more money now. Judy Wright said that the University had recognized a group was underpaid. We had passed the first motion, are all underpaid, and should try to gain more money for everyone. Pat Gibson was in favour of the motion, stating that we should try and if we fail, we can try again later. Aneka Mair brought a point to Carole Cameron concerning the repercussions of contract reopeners. A discussion ensued, whereby Carole pointed out the necessity of negotiating the term of the agreement and any other items to be discussed upon reopening the contract. The question was called.

Moved and Seconded by the  
Job Evaluation Committee

THAT A STRATEGY COMMITTEE BE SET UP AT THIS  
MEETING TO NEGOTIATE A WAGE REOPENER FOR OUR  
MEMBERS.

The motion was carried.

A discussion ensued regarding the strategy committee, who it would compose, what authority it would have. It was determined that the strategy committee would be an ad hoc committee which would meet and report their suggestions back to the membership. Lid Strand moved that nominations for the strike committee be opened. The motion was dropped.

Moved by Judy Wright  
Seconded by Margie Wally

THAT THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE BE IN  
CHARGE OF STRATEGY, ALONG WITH INTERESTED  
AUCE MEMBERS.

The Motion was Carried.

Gary Sawchuk stated that he had been led to believe that a ballot would go out to all the membership on such an important matter. He was concerned that such a decision had been made by 150 people. A discussion ensued as to how he may have gained this impression. Nancy Wiggs explained that no procedural motion was made, therefore the decision did not have to go to referendum ballot.

10. Other Business: Provincial By-laws (Proposed Changes)

Nancy Wiggs referred the membership to page 3 of the handout "Constitutional amendments to be considered at the 1981 convention, from local 1" Nancy Wiggs proposed we consider item 2 at the bottom of the page first.

Moved by Nancy Wiggs  
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT AUCE LOCAL I REITERATES THE POSITION TAKEN AT OUR FEBRUARY 19, 1981 UNION MEETING WITH RESPECT TO THE PAYMENT OF BACK PER CAPITA TAX. THE MOTION AT THAT MEETING READ "THAT AUCE LOCAL I NOT PAY TO THE PROVINCIAL ASSOCIATION THE OUTSTANDING ARREARS IN THE PER CAPITA TAX FOR THE PERIOD AUGUST 1980 TO DECEMBER 1980."

Lid Strand spoke against the motion, stating it was our constitutional obligation to pay dues. Carole and Nancy gave a brief history of the situation, ending with the principle that as the membership has passed this motion before it was the duty of the delegates of Local I to reiterate this position.

The motion was carried.

Item #1 was then discussed and motivated by Nancy Wiggs who stated that the AUCE Provincial membership had voted to affiliate to the CLC, therefore the Convention should abide by this decision.

Moved by Nancy Wiggs  
Seconded by Carole Cameron

WHEREAS THE PROVINCIAL CONVENTION HAS RECOMMENDED THAT THE PROVINCIAL ASSOCIATION ATTEMPT TO AFFILIATE TO THE CLC, AND WHEREAS THE PROVINCIAL ASSOCIATION HAS VOTED, THROUGH REFERENDUM BALLOT TO LOBBY TO AFFILIATE DIRECTLY TO THE CLC, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE CONVENTION TAKE A STAND THAT THE POLICY DECISIONS OF THE CONVENTION BE BINDING ON ALL LOCALS AND THAT DECISIONS OF INDIVIDUAL LOCALS MUST BE IN ACCORD WITH THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF AUCE, AND THAT ANY LOCAL OF THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE EMPLOYEES WILL CEASE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PROVINCIAL ASSOCIATION WHEN THEY AFFILIATE TO ANOTHER LABOUR BODY EXCEPT WHERE THE ENTIRE PROVINCIAL ASSOCIATION VOTES TO AFFILIATE TO ANOTHER LABOUR BODY.

Suzan Zagar stated that the issue was to determine whether Local 5 could remain in the Provincial. Sheila Rowsell said that the lawyer of the Provincial has said that there was nothing in the constitution preventing a local from

affiliating with another labour organization, although it is against the policy or principles of the association. Therefore, the Provincial executive wishes to bring the issue to the convention delegates. It is further hoped that the CLC will be more concerned about our desire to lobby to affiliate with them due to what has happened at local 5 with the CCU. The provincial has written to the CLC and requested a response by June 6th, to reconsider their refusal to grant the Association of University and College Employees affiliate status. Lid Strand spoke against the motion. A discussion ensued as to the constitutional validity of the behavior of local 5 in joining the CCU. It appeared to be a matter of interpretation. Carole Cameron called the question.

The motion was carried.

Page 2, section 15 was referred to by Richard Melanson. Richard moved an amendment to be added, and motivated this motion. Lid Strand wanted to amend the motion to change the work "conducted" to "concluded" in the first paragraph. The amendment made by Lid Strand was incorporated into the motion.

Moved by Richard Melanson  
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT AN AMENDMENT BE ADDED TO SECTION 15  
(REVENUE AND FINANCES) A. TO READ:  
AN INCREASE IN PER CAPITA TAX SHALL BE EFFECTIVE  
THE THIRD MONTH FOLLOWING THE MONTH IN WHICH  
THE REFERENDUM WAS CONCLUDED TO ALLOW LOCALS  
ADEQUATE TIME TO OBTAIN ANY LOCAL DUES INCREASES  
WHICH MAY BE NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE THE PER  
CAPITA TAX INCREASE.  
ANY LOCAL ON STRIKE OR LOCKED OUT SHALL NOT BE  
REQUIRED TO PAY THE PROVINCIAL PER CAPITA TAX  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DURATION OF THE STRIKE  
PER CAPITA TAX SHALL BE WAIVED WHEN ANY MEMBER  
OF THE BARGAINING UNIT IS ON STRIKE, LOCKED OUT  
OR AFFECTED BY SECONDARY PICKETING FOR MORE  
THAN TWO(2) WEEKS. AT ALL TIMES, THE ARTICLES  
OF THE CONSTITUTION DEALING WITH STRIKES SHALL  
BE ADHERED TO. IN ALL INSTANCES, THE PER CAPITA  
TAX IS PAYABLE FOR MEMBERS OF THE BARGAINING UNIT  
NOT AFFECTED BY THE STRIKE, LOCKOUT OR SECONDARY  
PICKETING.

The motion was carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 pm.